

THE MONTAGU MEMORIAL, BOMBAY

THE
MONTAGU MEMORIAL
BOMBAY

OPENED BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE
V. S. SRINIVASA SHASTRI
on 14th May, 1925

PUBLISHED BY
THE COMMITTEE OF THE
MONTAGU MEMORIAL FUND, BOMBAY
1925

FOREWORD

THE unveiling of the Montagu Statue was performed on 14th May, 1925 before a very large and representative gathering by the Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C. The speeches made on the occasion and the messages read at the meeting indicate the universal affection and esteem with which Mr. Montagu's memory is cherished in India. In order to make them available to the larger public, the Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund issue them in the form of a pamphlet.



**The Hon. Mr. Phiroze Sethna, in
opening the proceedings, said :**

MR. CHAIRMAN, YOUR HIGHNESS, LADIES
AND GENTLEMEN,

The Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund had expected that the statue of the Rt. Hon'ble Edwin Samuel Montagu would have been unveiled by His Excellency Sir Leslie Wilson, the Governor of Bombay. No one regrets it more than His Excellency himself that his absence from Bombay prevents him from so doing. The Committee thereafter came to the unanimous conclusion that if the ceremony were to be performed by a non-official, they could not possibly do better than request the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri to be the central figure of today's function, for the good reason that hardly any other Indian had come into closer and more intimate contact with Mr. Montagu, and that Mr. Montagu himself held Mr. Sastri in very high esteem and regard, of which there is additional proof

in those letters of the deceased statesman which were published for the first time less than a fortnight back. Whilst the Committee therefore congratulate themselves on the choice they have made, they feel very grateful that, in spite of the present weak state of his health, Mr. Sastri regarded it as a religious duty to respond to our call, and accepted our invitation.

After a brilliant University career, Mr. Montagu entered Parliament at the early age of 27, and was appointed Under-Secretary of State for India in 1910, when he was only 31. He occupied this office for four years till 1914. His speeches then and later were marked by a deep insight into the conditions of India's problem, by a fervent desire to do justice to this country, by a recognition of all that was natural and good in the Indian National movement, and by a firm resolve to satisfy the legitimate political aspirations of the Indian people. His utterances filled us with hope that, if ever he attained to the position of Secretary of State for India, he would advance the cause of this country as perhaps none of his predecessors had done. Even after he ceased to be Under-Secretary of State, his interest on Indian questions continued

unabated; and in a remarkable speech on the report on the Mesopotamian question, which he made in the House of Commons on 12th July, 1917, he severely criticised the then system of the Government of India as "too wooden, too inelastic, too ante-diluvian, to be of any use for the modern purposes we have in view," and warned the House that this system was doomed, and unless there were a change, Britain would lose its hold on India altogether. At the moment of making this very speech, he could not have anticipated that within only the next five days he would himself be called upon to fill the office of Secretary of State for India, which was undoubtedly his heart's cherished desire, because of the good he was conscious he would be able to do in that capacity.

Within less than five weeks of his appointment as Secretary of State, he made the memorable pronouncement of 20th August, 1917, which will go down in history as our *Magna Carta*, and for which his memory will endure in this land for ages to come. On that occasion, he observed that his "one ambition was to have the privilege of commending to Parliament what he believed to be the only

justification of the Empire, *viz.*, the step for Self-Government for India. To his mind the only Imperialism worth having was a trusteeship in India, to develop the country under the British flag into a partnership in the Commonwealth." From then onwards he steadfastly pursued this policy, and Mr. Sastri has borne excellent testimony to it. In 1921 Mr. Montagu, His Highness the Maharao of Cutch and Mr. Sastri were the representatives of the Government of India at the Imperial Conference held in that year. The Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund feel highly flattered that His Highness the Maharao of Cutch has honoured us by his distinguished presence at this gathering to-day. Referring to Mr. Montagu's work at the Conference, Mr. Sastri paid him a glowing but well-merited tribute, when he publicly declared that Mr. Montagu's attitude and support at the Conference had placed India under a deep debt of gratitude, and that he could not have been a more sympathetic or a stronger advocate of India's cause if he had been an Indian himself.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms might not have been considered adequate and satisfactory by some in this country, and perhaps the

political situation has already changed so much since these Reforms were introduced that further substantial advances have become imperative; but whatever differences of opinion might have prevailed and do prevail on these points, we Indians are all at one in giving credit to Mr. Montagu for having done his best, and no other man in his position could possibly have done better. He was determined to raise the political status of India, and to give the Indian people increasing opportunities and scope for growing to the full height of their stature. To mark, therefore, the very high esteem in which Mr. Montagu was held on this side of India for all that he was doing for this country, a Memorial Fund was started in 1920 with the object, first, of erecting a statue in his honor—a rare compliment to be paid to one so young and in his lifetime; and, secondly, if there remained a surplus, to devote it to some object of public usefulness in this City. The statue, which is to be unveiled today, is the work of a reputed London sculptor. Mr. Montagu gave sittings for the statue, and it is pronounced a striking likeness. After providing for the cost of the statue, the Committee expect they will have

in their hands close upon Rs. 75,000. They are not ready with their recommendation as to how best to utilise this amount to commemorate his memory, but they hope soon to lay before the subscribers some alternative proposals for their consideration and decision.

Mr. Montagu's statue, as you will admit, occupies a prominent site in one of the most important thoroughfares of this great City, and it may well be hoped that it will serve to remind our citizens and our countrymen for generations to come of the untiring efforts of a British statesman who throughout endeavored to understand the Indian view-point on all the great and difficult questions he had to tackle, and will likewise serve to remind them of the devotion and courage with which he always championed the interests of India in the Councils of the Empire. The Committee have decided upon an inscription in bronze on the statue, which we hope a grateful and appreciative public will endorse as perfectly appropriate. It will read:

EDWIN SAMUEL MONTAGU
HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA
1917—1922

HE LOVED THE PEOPLE OF INDIA
 HAD FIRM AND FULL FAITH IN THEM
 AND STROVE FOR THEIR FREEDOM
 WITH RARE COURAGE AND MAGNANIMITY.

Many very able British statesmen have filled the office of the Secretary of State for India. Some of them, like Lord Morley and others, rendered devoted service to the State, and be it remembered that Mr. Montagu had filled his apprenticeship under Lord Morley himself. Indians, however, cannot help but feel that of the twenty-six incumbents who till now have filled this exalted office, no one understood the soul of modern India so well and so deeply as did Mr. Montagu, and it was, therefore, that he was able to advance the cause of India to the extent he did. We regard it, therefore, as India's great misfortune that the force of circumstances compelled him to give up the work which was nearest his heart; and worse still, as we all greatly deplore, within less than three years of his resignation, this sincere friend of India passed away at the early age of 46 years. Of him it may be truly said:

One crowded hour of glorious life
 Is worth an age without a name.

His name will remain imperishably with us.

Of the eleven and a half years that Mr. Montagu spent in the service of the State, eight and a half were devoted to India. It is to keep alive amongst us the memory of the distinguished services rendered to the cause of India's political progress by Mr. Montagu during these eventful years that, as a humble tribute, we are presenting to this City his statue as a monument to his achievements. I have now, in the name of my Committee, the honour to request His Highness the Maharao of Cutch to call upon the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri to unveil the statue.

**His Highness the Maharao of Cutch
said :**

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

When I received the invitation of the Chairman and the Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund to attend this function, I happened to be in Bombay, and I welcomed its arrival. I accepted the invitation for two reasons. In the first place, I knew that I would be able to hear my friend Mr. Sastri speak, to listen to whom is always a pleasure.

The other reason, and the principal reason, why I welcomed the prospect of being present at this ceremony was that it would afford me an opportunity of expressing, on behalf of myself, and on behalf of my brother Princes the Rulers of the Indian States, our admiration for his character, our appreciation and deep sense of gratefulness for the acts of the statesman whose memory we are here assembled to perpetuate. Gentlemen, I must tell you at once that I have no special mandate from my brother Princes to represent them on this occasion, but knowing, as I do, the views and feelings which they have expressed, both in private and in public, I can say without any hesitation that it would be a matter of great satisfaction to them to know that a member of their Order had an opportunity of offering public testimony to their support and sympathy with a movement which aimed at perpetuating the memory of the late Right Hon'ble Edwin Samuel Montagu. As only one instance of the feelings which are entertained in our Indian States towards the late Mr. Montagu, I may remind you of the fact that H. H. the Maharaja of Nawanagar has erected in his capital a statue of Mr. Montagu, which I believe is the work of the same artist

who has executed the statue which will be unveiled this evening by Mr. Sastri. Gentlemen, Mr. Montagu was so well-known that I feel that anything that I could say to recall to your mind his services to India, or as regards his character, would be superfluous. However, I might mention that when Mr. Montagu was out in India, in connection with the Reforms with which his name will ever remain associated, I got to know him quite intimately. And again in 1921, when Mr. Sastri and I went to London to attend the Imperial Conference, I had many opportunities of coming in still more close contact with Mr. Montagu. I have a vivid recollection of the support which Mr. Montagu gave on that occasion to the cause of the position of our Indian countrymen in different parts of the British Empire. I feel, therefore, that I am in a position to add my personal testimony to the fact that in Mr. Montagu, India had a powerful advocate, a good friend, and a warm and sincere sympathiser with her healthy and legitimate aspirations. Indeed, his services to India were great and invaluable; but perhaps in a way they were even greater to his own country. We want men of Mr. Montagu's type, for it is

they who strengthen the bonds of unity between India and Great Britain. I have no desire unnecessarily to occupy your time ; you will be getting eager, as I am getting, to listen to Mr. Sastri, but let me, gentlemen, say one word more to offer you my personal congratulations for your good sense, for the sense of appreciation which you are showing in erecting a memorial statue of Mr. Montagu. Your action indicates that the heart of India, true to her traditions, is not irresponsive to those who entertain feelings of sympathy for her and care for her welfare. Further, I beg to offer my warm thanks to the Chairman and the Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund for permitting me to take part in to-day's proceedings. And I would now request you, Mr. Sastri, kindly to proceed with the duty which you have undertaken to-day, a duty which I feel sure could not have been placed in abler or more suitable hands.

The following messages were received :

H. E. THE VICEROY

I am delighted to hear your Committee has erected a statue of Mr. Montagu which will be unveiled to-morrow by Mr. Sastri. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. Montagu at the India Office for nearly two years, and have personal knowledge of the

genuine love which he felt for India and the intense anxiety with which he strove to promote the welfare of her people. His policy, of course, was controversial ; its wisdom or otherwise will be finally established by its fruits when the vituperations of critics and the eulogies of friends are alike forgotten. I am heartily glad that his work should now be recognised by representative Indians, and that this monument should be erected to his memory, for during the years that I knew him he was often oppressed with a sense that his work was inadequately appreciated even by those whom he was so anxious to serve.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY

I very much regret I am unable to be present and unveil Mr. Montagu's statue. I am very grateful to the Committee and subscribers for their action, which has made it possible to erect a statue in Bombay to the memory of one who loved India and who devoted his great ability to India's prosperity. Mr. Montagu's death was a great loss, not only to India, but to his personal friends, of whom I have the honour to be one, and the statue to be unveiled to-day will be for all time a reminder to Bombay and all who visit the City, of a great man who sacrificed much for others.

THE JAMSAHEB, HIS HIGHNESS RANJIT SINGHJI OF NAWANAGAR

I am glad Bombay is honoring the late Rt. Hon. E. S. Montagu, India's greatest friend.

The memory of Edwin Montagu deserves all the gratitude, honor and affection, which the people and Princes of India can show. No Englishman made so many sacrifices for India. He sacrificed health, wealth and a great career in order to secure

for India justice and fair-play within the Empire. He made the best effort to obtain India's love for England by his just policy. Posterity alone will do full justice to his name and fame. I hope every city in India will follow Bombay's example.

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF BIKANER

Deeply regret inability to accept your kind invitation and attend ceremony of unveiling the statue of my old friend the late Mr. Montagu who is truly entitled to the esteem, affection and gratitude of all our brother Indians. He was a warm hearted and most devout friend and ardent champion of our Motherland, and a most unselfish custodian of her interests. His sincerity of purpose and single-minded devotion to duty were beyond all praise. He thoroughly appreciated and understood and whole-heartedly sympathised with India's aspirations, and what he accomplished for the Princes and people of India was no easy or light task, and I am confident that when the heat and strife of political controversy has been lulled, impartial historians, both in Great Britain and India, will accord him a high place amongst British statesmen, and that their verdict will be that he not only served India but that his great work also helped to consolidate the British Empire.

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF PORBANDAR

Regret inability to attend in person and share Bombay's privilege of rendering honor to the memory of Mr. Montagu, the great statesman whose watchword was Love, Work and Sacrifice for India.

HIS HIGHNESS THE THAKORE OF LIMBDI

In honoring Mr. Montagu's memory, Bombay not only honors herself but gives concrete expression to the gratitude of the people of India.

India will never forget his genuine sympathy, unremitting labour and remarkable sacrifice for her welfare, which have permanently enshrined his name in the hearts of her people.

In the constitutional history of India Mr. Montagu's name has been written for all time in letters of gold.

DR. BESANT

Permit me to say how thoroughly I associate myself with the tribute of homage to one of India's greatest friends; one who stood by her through official disapproval, and wrecked his career for her sake. He loved India with a deep love and was ever faithful to her, and fought for her liberty. While he was at the India Office, he worked the Reforms in the spirit in which he shaped them, and it was no fault of his that, after he had been driven from office, they were worked in a niggardly instead of in a generous spirit. History will do him justice and will repair the injury done to him alike in England and in India by those who knew nothing of the difficulties he faced and overcame.

MRS. NAIDU

I join in tribute to the memory of the brave, brilliant martyred English statesman who made the first authentic gesture of abdication in respect to Indian ideals and, to his own utter ruin, championed India's cause with sacrificial devotion.

SIR DORAB TATA

Regret unable to be present at Montagu Memorial meeting. The movement has my whole-hearted sympathy. He was a great friend of India.

SIR IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA

I wish cordially to associate myself with the movement for commemorating the inestimable services which Mr. Montagu rendered both to England and to India.

**The Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri
said :**

OPINIONS have always differed as to the mutual influence and relative importance of individuals and impersonal forces in the actual shaping of human affairs. It would in any case be a shallow and partial view to leave out the contribution made by great personalities. There can be no doubt that the recent political history of India would have been very different if Mr. Montagu had not been in power in Whitehall during the later years of the War. It has been stated that not only Mr. Austen Chamberlain, but even Lord Curzon, had a share in the authorship of the declaration of policy made in August, 1917. Only when Cabinet secrets are revealed can we know the exact truth of the statement. It is known, however, that before Montagu assumed office,

the first Reform proposals of Lord Chemsford's Government had been turned down by Mr. Chamberlain on the ground that they contained no suggestions for a real transfer of power to the people of India. One has only to read again the speech made by Mr. Montagu in the debate on the Mesopotamian scandal to see that three of the most important points in the declaration were already adumbrated there. First, a liberal policy had to be clearly laid down; secondly, the first instalment must be given at once; thirdly, the people of India should be given a measure of Responsible Government. Critics, if they please, may even read into the language employed by Mr. Montagu a clear germ of the idea of Dyarchy. The declaration itself was only the beginning. His subsequent mission to India, the negotiations with officials and non-officials of all sorts, the formulation of the Reform proposals, and then the drudgery of the Bill and the Committee, and in conclusion, its piloting through Parliament afforded at every stage an example of a rare type of patience, ability and parliamentary strategy. So consummate a master of these attributes as Mr. Lloyd George has himself borne eloquent testimony to the marvellous

skill and resourcefulness with which Mr. Montagu managed this extraordinarily difficult business through a period of two years and a quarter, and accomplished what indeed should be regarded from every point of view as the greatest and most momentous step that has been taken by Britain towards the constitutional position of India in the Empire. No doubt the conditions of a World-War and the fact that Great Britain was ruled by a Coalition under the unquestioned sway of Mr. Lloyd George were powerful favouring circumstances. Still, which of us does not feel that these powerful forces could not have been wielded to such good purpose on behalf of India by one who loved her less than Montagu, or had not his ability and driving power ?

Take next our Dominion Status. Mr. Montagu was sleepless over this question. He has told me how he would lie on the watch for every opportunity of getting India in wherever, in diplomatic or political matters, the Dominions were mentioned. When he took the chair at the Financial Commission in connection with the Treaty of Versailles, it was as a member of the Indian Delegation, and not as a member of the British Cabinet. Our

admission to the League of Nations was not secured without a struggle, in which again it fell to him to carry our point. Unfortunately, a certain influential section of our press took to deriding and decrying such things, and even to-day India, as a whole, is very far indeed from understanding the importance of this status of a Dominion, which we have acquired in international affairs, and how it helps us materially in our struggle for the same status in internal affairs.

Another thing, not, it is true, of the same order of consequence, was the appointment of a public commission to conduct a thorough enquiry into the Panjab atrocities. It will be remembered that the Government of India had suggested a restricted inquiry of a private and departmental nature into the conduct of certain officials concerned in the administration of Martial Law. Mr. Montagu himself was inclined at first to take this view, but when the demand for a full and public enquiry was pressed on him by a majority of the Liberal Deputation of 1919, he saw the propriety of the course and ordered accordingly. Nobody now disputes the great advantage that not only the Panjab but the whole of India obtained

through the inquiry. But I now venture the proposition, and trust it will be generally admitted, that we might not have won the point but for the fact that Montagu happened to preside over the India Office.

Why, the weight of his personality and the enormous impetus that it gave to the growth of the Reforms day by day in India were so marked that his resignation was felt as a mighty relief by those sections who chafed under the new regime; and many non-officials stated in their evidence before the recent Reforms Enquiry Committee that the moment when the reins fell from his hands marked the dividing line between the success and the failure of Dyarchy.

Long before he became Secretary of State, Mr. Montagu had acquired a great mastery of Indian problems, and taken more than once a bold and unconventional line in advocating India's progress. One such occasion deserves to be recalled. About the end of 1911 was published the famous despatch of Lord Hardinge, with the apparent concurrence of the Secretary of State, promising Provincial Autonomy in a federated India as the immediate goal of advance. The paragraph instantly became

famous, and gave rise in one quarter to great hopes and in another to great fears. The Marquess of Crewe, then Secretary of State, being assailed by Lord Curzon and other reactionaries, thought it prudent to explain away the paragraph, and to declare that no departure in the nature of a new constitutional move was intended, but that it was only Lord Curzon's own policy which would be faithfully fulfilled. The disappointment in India was acute and became vocal. Though Under-Secretary at the time, Montagu went to his constituency in Cambridge, interpreted the Provincial Autonomy paragraph as intended to satisfy the growing aspirations of India, and thus restored our drooping spirits. For this act of seeming indiscipline, he was subsequently blamed in Parliament, but he did not budge an inch. What I said publicly at that time will bear repetition now :

Mr. Montagu starts his official connection with India with a vivid perception of the ideas and tendencies of the present time. It is a rare joy to find emerging now and then from the Liberal ranks a young politician of his stamp, endowed with imagination to understand, and courage to welcome openly, the struggles for constitutional freedom of a people held in political dependence.

After the inauguration of the Reforms he had a clear vision of his next task. He put it

compendiously to me: "I must hereafter abolish myself." He was in earnest about transferring as rapidly as possible his ultimate power and responsibility to the authorities in India by conventions and rules framed under various sections of the Act. In the changed atmosphere after his resignation there seems to be a consensus of opinion that devolution by this process would be attended with difficulty. But I cannot resist the feeling that if the author of the scheme had had the time to apply himself to the task before the original momentum was exhausted, the technical objections would somehow or other have been swept aside.

The growth of India was many-sided in his time, and he was constantly engaged in tussles of one kind or another. Kenya and Churchill were not the least of these. Whenever he received a check in these encounters, he would exclaim: "I will resign on this issue and appeal to India." The idea generally tickled me to laughter. But he would seriously admonish me that India was his constituency, and by constitutional usage he must seek the support of Indians when he was baulked in championing their interests. That is how, stripped of

forms and technicalities, the situation appeared to him in essentials. His usefulness was to be measured by the moral support that we gave him. How bitterly he was disappointed in this expectation I need not say. Except a certain section—weighty, it is true, considering quality, but comparatively small in number and without influence—the country as a whole pronounced the Reforms worthless, boycotted the Prince of Wales, and decreed Non-Co-Operation with the unrighteous Government. In our consuming anger we rejected the advice even of such friends as Colonel Wedgwood, destroyed our auxiliary organisation in London, and resolved that we should rely so exclusively on ourselves as not to care for the aid of any individual or party in England. And we wonder, after all this, that we have no genuine well-wishers or champions among Britishers. It was Montagu's deliberate judgment that, if we had not decided on these suicidal plans, he might have continued in office, and taken India another stage or two along the road of advance by this time, in anticipation of the ten-year period. Truly, misfortune has befogged our wits and wrought confusion in our counsels. Consider also for one

moment why he published the Viceroy's cable about the Turkish negotiations at the risk of his own appointment. Controversy has distracted our attention to some extent from the central feature of the case. It was the right of a Dominion, and therefore of India as well, to state publicly her point of view in a matter where she was vitally concerned. There was no danger which he was not prepared to face, no opposition which he was not ready to brave, in pushing India's claims forward. Some of his personal friends and admirers have written to me expressing their profound grief that Indians have not realised the full extent of their indebtedness to Montagu. Alas! this is only too true. He neglected his position in British public life, and devoted himself entirely to the service of India. It is sad that such a whole-hearted and selfless worker should have been insufficiently appreciated. Some clever people among us hold that in political bargaining you must never seem pleased, and that you must repudiate your negotiators; and there are tacticians who believe that you can best strike terror into the hearts of your enemies by scowling at your friends and occasionally chastising them.

Not that I am a blind partisan of Montagu. I condemned his policy of Reverse Councils and strongly disapproved of his consenting to the Rowlatt Act and other measures of repression. But let us recognise, on a calm survey of the facts, that our affairs are so disorganised and tangled that friends find it impossible to do us good without at the same time doing some harm. It seems to be the price exacted of all Reformers. Lord Morley could not get his Reforms through without deporting a number of our leaders. Look at Lord Olivier, our Labor Secretary of State. He has burdened us with the Lee proposals to the tune of a crore and a quarter, and he has sanctioned the Bengal Ordinance. What have we got in return? The price has been paid, but the goods are not in sight yet.

I speak from personal knowledge of Montagu's character and work. I remember the days of hard thinking and anxious deliberation in the cold months of 1917 in Delhi, when he had to win over the members of Lord Chelmsford's Government and the heads of Provincial Governments. Just imagine what it must have meant for him. Do you wonder that he now and then threw up his hands in

despair? The plans changed from day to day, and ground patiently gained would be lost in a moment. Mr. Bhupendranath Basu, who was intimately associated with him in that strenuous period, has told me how again and again they wiped the slate clean and started afresh. Nor did the troubles come from officials only. One day Montagu paced across his tent excitedly and said, naming a certain leader of Indian thought: "What am I to do with this gentleman? He is my despair. I tell him the position reached at a certain moment. He says it won't do and asks for more. I make an effort with my official colleagues and meet his wishes. Hardly has he thanked me before he puts up his demand. I find it very hard this time, but somehow manage to bring my colleagues to agree. I tell him of my success, expecting to be congratulated, but all I get is a higher demand and a settled look of dissatisfaction."

Our interviews in London were frequent. As soon as I appeared in his office, he would draw a big chair near the fire-place, and with his large long legs sprawling about, and crossing and re-crossing each other frequently, would motion me to the sofa near,

and start talking on all subjects under the sun with such freedom and cordiality that I assure you I never felt that there was a barrier between us of either race, status or official reserve. He had some abrupt ways too, and I can imagine one who did not know him intimately feeling that his conduct was strange. Once something in our talk brought a very urgent matter to his recollection, and he suddenly got up and resumed his seat at the table, hiding his face from me with his right hand in his characteristic way, and though I stood for a minute or two trying to say good-night, he simply took no further notice of me. After his resignation I once went to urge him to stand for his constituency again. I did not succeed. "I am yet young," he said, "and can afford to go out of public life for some years and re-enter it when I choose. I am poor—" and seeing a look of incredulity on my face, he added, "I am a poor member of a rich family, and must earn enough to support a growing family." Almost the last occasion I saw him was after the McCardie judgment in the O'Dwyer-Nair case. The judge had blamed the Secretary of State for India at the time, without caring to acquaint himself with the facts

of that aspect of the case. Montagu felt the sting of it—from the Indian point of view—and writhed under it like a man in physical pain. He thought that if Mr. Lansbury's motion were slightly amended, it had every chance of being accepted by the House. He grieved that neither Mr. Asquith (as he then was) nor Mr. Ramsay MacDonald took that view. His parting words were so tender that I can never recall them without emotion: "Forgive my talking like this. Everybody tells me that you are now-a-days so dispirited that I must try and cheer you up. But here I have been talking for the last hour of nothing but my troubles and woes."

Of the many British statesmen that have served India, only two deserve by their eminence to rank with him—Burke and Morley. In the lives of both of them India was but an episode, and neither visited India or knew many Indians. Burke had his warm Celtic blood roused to passion by the tale of India's wrongs, and employed in her defence his vast knowledge, exuberant imagination and gorgeous eloquence. But the sum of his gigantic efforts was only to establish that in India Europeans had obligations and Indians

had rights. Morley brought an immense reputation and great personal influence to bear on his task in Whitehall. And though his Reform was substantial for his day, he shrank from the full application of Liberal principles to the case of India, and ruled out parliamentary institutions as almost unthinkable. It is the unique glory of Montagu to have cherished from the beginning faith in the capacity of the people of India to bear the burden of Responsible Government. His Liberalism possessed the rare quality of courage and comprehended Asiatics in its range. He had bold plans for binding India to the Commonwealth of Great Britain. He devoted his great talents solely to the furtherance of these plans, and did not hesitate, when the time came, to sacrifice himself in the cause. Whether we test his record by intention, or measure it by actual achievement, he stands a clear head and shoulders above all other benefactors of India. Here was a Montagu, when comes such another ?

**Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas, in
proposing a vote of thanks, said :**

YOUR HIGHNESS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I rise to perform the very pleasant task of proposing a hearty vote of thanks to the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri for having performed the ceremony this afternoon. As you all know, our Rt. Hon'ble friend has come all the way from Madras to perform this ceremony, and I think my Hon'ble friend Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna will bear me out when I say that despite the convalescent stage in which Mr. Sastri is at present, he very readily complied with Mr. Sethna's request without any hesitation. It is a long way to come to Bombay from Madras, and bearing in mind the season at present, it could not have been a very comfortable journey. The Committee of the Montagu Memorial Fund therefore appreciate Mr. Sastri's kindness all the more, and the speech that Mr. Sastri has delivered to-day is bound to have earned for him the gratitude of you all, ladies and gentlemen, present here.

I feel that there is a special reason for gratification that Mr. Sastri should be called to

unveil Mr. Montagu's statue here to-day. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that Mr. Sastri was one of the few Indians who enjoyed the confidence and regard of the late Mr. Montagu, and it is in the fitness of things that on an occasion like this Mr. Sastri should unveil to the public of Bombay the permanent likeness of Mr. Montagu as a mark of our esteem and regard for that great statesman.

Whether many Indians consider Mr. Montagu's Reforms as adequate or not, there is no doubt that all Indians unanimously recognise Mr. Montagu's responsibility for the first step in the direction of Self-Government for India. Mr. Montagu can truly be said to belong to that small band of far-sighted, noble-hearted, illustrious British statesmen who had the correct vision of a truly greater Britain, and a solid British Empire. One of the most eminent of these, Lord Macaulay, speaking in the House of Lords in 1833 on the first Government of India Bill passed in that year, said that he "found himself irresistibly impelled to say a few words on one part of that Bill," which he called "that wise, that benevolent, that noble clause, which

enacts that no native of our Indian Empire shall, by reason of his color, his descent, or his religion, be incapable of holding office". He said: "At the risk of being called by that nickname, which is regarded as the most opprobrious of all nicknames by men of selfish hearts and contracted minds—at the risk of being called a philosopher—I must say that to the last day of my life, I shall be proud of having been one of those who assisted in the framing of the Bill containing that clause." The fears that were then urged against the British Parliament passing a clause to that effect were dealt with by Lord Macaulay in his speech as under :

"We are told that the time can never come when the natives of India can be admitted to high civil and military office. We are told that this is the condition on which we hold our power. We are told that we are bound to confer on our subjects every benefit which they are capable of enjoying—no—which it is in our power to confer on them—no—which we can confer on them without hazard to our domination. Against that proposition I solemnly protest as inconsistent alike with sound policy and sound morality."

He wound up his speech with the following noble and inspiring words :

“It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system ; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government ; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history.”

These words require to be changed in very few respects to be made applicable to the period when Mr. Montagu persuaded the British Parliament to take their courage in both their hands and secure for India the first substantial step towards Self-Government. If only the Act of Parliament for which Mr. Montagu was responsible is interpreted and put into practice by his successors in the same spirit as Lord Macaulay mentioned in 1833, Great Britain has little to fear regarding either the attachment of India to her, or the strength to her from her connection with India. It is devoutly to be wished

that, to use Lord Macaulay's words, no "men of selfish hearts and contracted minds" will be allowed to come in the way of the British Parliament and people approaching the day which Lord Macaulay termed "the proudest day in English history". He fully realised that victory, power and strength are never constant or unchanging. May the British statesmen earnestly and truly try to work up to that "title to glory" which Lord Macaulay was ambitious for. For it is only sincere work towards a goal of this nature that can bind one-fifth of the human race to another country by ties of friendship, admiration and lasting gratitude. It is from this point of view that Bombay wishes to honor the late Rt. Hon'ble Edwin Montagu, and it is in the fitness of things that the head of the first society of its kind started in India to serve India should perform the ceremony. Your Highness, ladies and gentlemen, I have no doubt that you will pass the vote of thanks with acclamation.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure I am expressing your opinion when I say that we are very glad to see in our midst His Highness the Maharao of Cutch, and I think I am

voicing your feelings when I say that we appreciate his joining hands with the citizens of Bombay in paying their tribute to Mr. Montagu.

Sir Henry Macnaghten, in seconding the proposition, said :

YOUR HIGHNESS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I have been asked to second this vote of thanks to Mr. Sastri, but I am sure I need say very little in expressing our appreciation of the kindness of one of the hardest-worked and certainly one of the most widely-travelled men in India in coming to us today.

I have been in trouble for it recently, and I am not going to refer again to Bombay as the first City in India in any but the purely geographical meaning of the expression. But I am sure that in all his travels, Mr. Sastri will be very lucky if he finds another City in which there is more sincere, more happy, and more fruitful friendship and co-operation between the various communities than in Bombay; and that is the spirit in which we

may look for the fulfilment of Mr. Montagu's dreams.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have much pleasure in putting to you this vote of thanks to Mr. Sastri.

